IMT Nuremberg Archives

H – 960

International Court of Justice

H0960 – 0001

COMM A
Take3 page 1
Gallagher
14 June 1946
1400 - 1530

An exhibit no should be given the document presented on page 26

OK

AFTERNOON SESSION

(The hearing reconvened at 1400 hours, 14 June 1946)

HELMUT KNOCHEN, Recalled.
DIRECT EXAMINATION - continued.

H0960-0002

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Will you remind the witness he is still under oath.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

DR. MERKEL: I have questions to put to the witness for about another half an hour.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Very well.

BY DR. MERKEL:

Q I wish first of all the witness to voice his opinion concerning document RF 1224, which is along the general lines concerning the big action against the Parisian Jews.

A This document is known as the Dannecker concerning actions against Jews in Paris. This document proves that Dannecker special commission worked independently, and the practical carrying out of this order was in the hands of the French police.

Q Could one draw out of this a conclusion that your Security Police Group stationed in any part of the Security Service of the SD in France had participated in same?

A No, this could prove that Dannecker was in connection with the French Police independently, and that the carrying out of the order was largely in the hands of the French Police.

Q The prosecution might frequently mention certain transport of Jews, prisoners, or workers from France into Germany. Who was responsible for these transports?

H0960-0003

A This Dannecker Commission also was in charge of these transports.

Q The transportation of Jews?

A Yes.

Q Any other cases?

A Concerning the work prisoners, they were transported to the railroad station Compaigne by the military groups, or the military corps, and from there were taken over by units of the Order Police. These Order Police were ~~handed over of what I say was the Superior SS and Police Leaders, and~~ under the chief of the Order Police.

Q Now one more question concerning the shooting of hostages, and the prosecution claims that a large number of hostages were shot; among other things, in Paris the number 11,000 shootings is mentioned. What do you know concerning this?

A I believe that this number is much too high. I only know concerning the shootings in 1940, and 1942, and I can not remember the exact number. However, I say that this number was much too high.

Q Can you give your opinion about the approximate number?

A I do believe previously that after the Superior SS and Police Leader was named, that there was about three of these reprisal measures, and in the course of this period about 180 to 190 people were shot. If you had to complete that number of people shot previously, that is, 1940 to '42, then you will come to a number in my opionion of about 700, or as high as 800.

Q How do you explain this evident difference between the number of prosecution of 11,000 and your statement?

MAJOR MURRAY: Just a momemt, the witness testified he did not know how many were shot, and now he is asked can he explain the difference between the numbers he knew that were shot and the report of 11,000 that

H0960 - 0004

were shot. It is entirely immaterial.

DR. MERKEL: I am sure the witness can answer whether during this period other people were added both not only killed and not shot as reprisal measures, but during combat, or some kind of fighting?

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Q MRXXTAXKKR: Do you know how the prosecution arrived at this figure of 11,000 people?

THE WITNESS: No.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Then I do not believe the witness you will be able to explain further on that point.

BY DR MERKEL:

Q I now present to you the document PS-715, R 294, concerning measures against French Officers, which were carried out with the approval of the German Embassy, the SIPO, and the SD?

A This document proves that the highest offices evidently ordered to have arrested who were French officers; the Commander in Chief West was supposed to prepare such a list. In preparing this list the commander in chief of the army was represented as well as the commanders of the Navy, or Airforce, and also was a representative of the Commander in Chief West. The Security Police also took part in preparing this list. This document proves that there was no ~~General all around~~ over-all General West, but that all material was formally before that checked thoroughly by all officers concerned. It was unquestionably pointed out that the various specific points were brought out by these various organizations in order to carry out this measure. Therefore, proof that this was not a rush action but that of points of view, and that the guilt of the persons concerned was checked thoroughly before.

H0960 - 0005

COMM A
3-4
Gallagher
14 June

Q I shall now submit document 7913,RF 422 to say about German soldiers, the Gestapo,and officials are mentioned in this document who arrested people in Oyonnax. Were there any offices of Security Police and the SD in this town at all?

A I do not know that there was an office of this Security Police and the SD in Oyonnax, it was probably a very small town, and the document mentioned this in the occupation of the German troops. Mention is also made of the fact that the town was shelled. This points towards from a military action.

Q When you were interrogated by the defense counsel of the SD on the war diary of Potrovsky, and submitted document 7257, RF 405, you said, when you were interrogated, that the mention that was made of the SD in this document several times was to be considered as being meant to be Security Police. Do you mean to say that the measures described in this document are to be considered measures taken by the Security Police.

A I want to point out that the members who had taken part in the mentioned military actions here could not have been members of Department III,but must have been members of Department IV, which saw to the carrying out actions against resistant movements. The participation of those members of the Security Police was ordered by the General Staff France in Lyons. If I remember the real diary showed the two generals were commissioned with carrying out these measures in order to bring about once more peace and order in southern France. This was a miliary action in which troops and airforce took part. The part that the members of the Security Police had in this action was an infinitesimal one under the leadership of Hauptsturmbannfuehrer Geissler in order to support Department IC. At the same time the military intelligence staff of IC had also been made to do so. The members of the Security Police were used to carry out

4

H0960 - 0006

interrogations, and by means of these interrogations to find out new groups of terrorists.

Q The French Prosecution submitted a report for war prisoners, and for people concerning the forces of evaucation, and mutual treatment of prisoners of war. I want to read a few short passages to you on page 626 of the German document. Registrations are spoken of that were carried out in order to seize the men who were liable to labor service.

M. MONERRAY: Pardon me, what number is that?

DR. MERKEL: The document has no number. It was just mentioned once during the interrogation but was not submitted as an exhibit.

M. MONNERRAY: It has not been in court.

DR. MERKEL: I don't think so.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: May we see it, please (Present document to the Commissioner)

BY DR MERKEL:

Q Was this registritation of people who were liable for labor service one of the tasks of the Security Police?

A No, the Security Police had nothing to do with the registration and rounding up of people liable for labor service. Department III only made general reports on the effects of labor employment. No department of the Security Police had anything to do with putting this into effect.

Q On page 715, executions in the woods of Robinson is mentioned. Do you know anything about such executions carried out there by Security Police?

A No, I know nothing about this.

Q In the last quote from this document on page 716 it says: "The Department W in France has a department which has the greatest

H0960 - 0007

number of people which had been tortured; the time was begun in the year of 1944, and that a long chain of massacres for the Germans no longer try to disguise the executions behind the mass of orderly triumphs." What can you as Chief of the Security Police in France say to this?

A The large number of dead people, and the numerous number of small villages mentioned shows also that there was no offices in the Security Police in any of these small villages, and the time during which these actions, or events, took place were shortly before, during and after the invasion, and were as part of military measures. I should also like to point out that during the time of invasion the offices of the Security Police in this department were not staffed with additional personnel. The victims mentioned here must be victims of military measures taken in order to protect the troops, and propbably carried out by terrorists behind the front.

Q A further mention is made of the Gestapo prison in Bonscat, and likewise, mention is made of the Gestapo prison in Merignac. Were there any offices of the Security Police in either of these places?

Q I never heard of these places mentioned as seats of a Security Police or SD office. At best there were only very small offices in the capitals of the departments, but not every capital of a department had such SD or Security Police office. Only in a very few border towns were there any headquarters of the frontier police. That is, towns which were not capitals of a department.

Q In this document mention is made of several people, and two of them were one Poinsot, and the other Cilerier, who had been arrested, and killed, and were listed French Nationals. Do you know whether these people mentioned were members of the Security Police and the SD, or of the French

H0960-0008

Police?

M. MONERRAY: May I interrupt again and find out what document he speaks about?

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Yes.

DR. MERKEL: This id document also that has no number, which was submitted with a number of other documents as a group.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Well, Dr Merkel, you appreciate that when one is reading a record you can not tell what is being referred to, and when you read the records that it is not possible to know what is going on, and have to identify the paper in some way so that the record can be made showing these papers when the record is being read.

DR MERKEL: Would it be agreeable if I gave this document a number and I will present it today.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY:No. If they had not been already submitted, we would like to know where they were, if you could give the date, submitted, and if they had the page numbers on them, with the same sort of heading. If they had been submitted we would like to/able to identify them the same way knowing what they are.

M. MONERRAY: I think I have it.

DR MERKEL: Sofar as I know the document was submitted with a group of other documents in court.

M. MONERRAY: I think it is part of a document put into evidence, and it is only one half of it,and the document is F 561. I wonder if this document has been translated into the four languages. If not, I don't think it is in evidence even though it has been read. I think it would be advisable to check out F 561 to see if it has been given an RF exhibit number.

7

H0960-0009

DR MERKEL: It is RF 306.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: You are referring to the first page?

DR MERKEL: Yes, the first page.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Could we have that document here identified before the witness is asked to testify considering it, so when we read the record we will be able to make reference to what you refer.

BY DR. MERKEL: Q Do you remember my question?

A Yes. By the names I know they can only be Frenchmen. I have had no one with the Security Police with those names. I remember that the name Poinsot was mentioned once by the French Police. A certain Poinsot was to receive a function with the police in Vichy, but he had not been in Vichy up to that time. I donot know if that same man is the man or not.

Q On page 2 is mentioned a sergeant who split a prisoners head by means of a key during interrogations. Can you tell uswhether this man was a member of the Security Police.

A This man was evidently a member of the Army, who belonged to the guard personnel of the army, detention institution, for mention is made here that a certain borders "H" was the place concerned.

Q I shall submit another document to you, C-45. This document is a regulation concerning the combatant fight against terrorist.

A This is an order of the Commander in Chief West concerning the right against terrorist, and this order shows and you can see that is his command for the army, and shows further that the security of the troops has been so endangered by the terrorist that police measures are evidently no longer counted on, and the troops are to take their own actions. This condition was not the same in all the districts, but in some districts the army troops were so much endangered that communications

H0960 - 0010

could no longer be sustained between two offices, if a number of cars or convoys did not keep up the communications together.

MAJOR MURRAY: One moment. If I remember this document was handed to this man, and he was not asked a question about it. He appearently was told what was in the document, and the Commission can not tell what is in the document without his helping out.

DR. MERKEL: The question was to read the order. The order concerned the SD here, and to see whether the Security Police, or the Security Service had any hands in these matters, and I would like the witness to answer that question.

MAJOR MURRAY: I believe you can determine that from the document itself. You do not need help from this Gestapo witness to read the order.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: May I see the document please. Is it in German?

THE INTERPRETER: Yes, sir. (Whereupon same read to the Commission).

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: I think that is the proper question.

BY DR. MERKEL:

Q Will you answer the question.

A This order shows that the Security Police was not asked to take any part in the investigations concerning the situations, and measures mentioned here, but was only informed afterwards after skirmishes and actions had already taken place. The same was true of the military commander in chief who was also informed only afterwards.

Q Was it one of the means, did it belong to the work or aims, tasks, and measures of the activities of the Security Police and SD in France to take Jews out of concentration camps, and also to take out political enemies from prisoner of war camps.

H0960 - 0011

Q To such camps in order to execute them?

A No, I know of no case where the Security Police was employed in such actions.

Q The defense counsel for the SD has already submitted us the(German) "Decree Bulletin" PS 1650. Did the Security Police in France have any hand in this measure?

A No.

Q Why not?

A From the contents of the document which was submitted to me here, which is proof that this decree would have had no basis at all in France.

Q Simimarly, the Field Commando Order 498-PS was submitted to you. Did the Security Police in France have any hand in the execution of commando members, or parachutists, or were these measures not carried out?

A The directives given France concerning this Commando Order was that parachutists were to remain with the troops, or handed over to the troops. This means that parachutists in uniform were always,if they had fallen into the hands of the Security Police, were handed over immediately to the nearest airforce station.

Q I shall like to submit the document that is already handed to you, C-176,DB 228, concerning executions in Bordeaux. Who executed these people in Bordeaux?

A The Navy executed these commandos in Bordeaux.

Q Were the Security Police in France used to carry out the socalled "Nacht und Nebel Erlass" document L-90?

A Practical execution of this decree had already been put into effect before the higher Police SS and Leadership office was instituted.

H0960 - 0012

The Sr.Judge decided as to whether the prisoner was to be handed over as a "Night and fog prisoner." When the office of the higher SS and Police Leader was instituted the Security Police only continued to carry out the work which formerly had to be carried out by the Secret Field Police. The Security Police took over the prisoner termed as "A night and fog prisoner" by the Sr. judge, and caused him to be transported to a Gestapo office within the Reich, which sofar as I know was in Cologne.

Q This also claims that members of the Gestapo and SD arrested Foreign Internationalists, and punished and sentenced them by summary court trials. Were such trials carried out in France?

A I only know that such arrests took place when the persons concerned had committed offenses against the regulations of the occupying power; or, if they were suspected of having attached with a group that had taken action against, or intended to take action against the occupying power. The disciplinary measures that I knew of were only measures ordered by the RSHA, the protective custody, by a military court trial.

Q Did cases of family or clan arrests occur within the area of the commander in France?

A I remember that immediately after the institution of the higher SS and Police Leader a yellow poster was published threatening that family members of a person who had fled, after committing an offense, would also be arrested. I know nothing,however, ofa practical execution of this order . In order to carry this measure out, it would have had to be necessary to know who the criminal was,and if one knew who it was, it would have been necessary to locate the members of his family, and considering the very small staff we had, this was practically impossible.

H0960-0013

Q Were inmates of detention institutions in France murdered by the Security Police in order to prevent their liberation by the Allies?

A I know nothing of this. The settling of prisoner questions was regulated by the military commander in chief at the beginning of the invasion, or rather before the invasion took place. I already mentioned that the Army detention institutes had always been under the supervision guarding and maintenance of the military administration. This state of affairs remained until the very end, and as such the evacuation, detention buildings, and prisons were the concern of the military administration.

Q Do you know anything about the confiscation of plundering of public property, especially, Jewish property in France?

A No, I do not remember any cases, because all confiscations had to be carried out by the military administration.

Q Was there any persecution of the churches by the Security Police while you were in France?

A No.

DR. MERKEL: No further questions.

EXXERXXGAWLIKX

DR. GAWLIK: I would like to submit four documents to the witness which I have just now received.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: What documents are they.

DR GAWLIK: The SD.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Have they been submitted by the prosecution.

DR. GAWLIK: Yes.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Very well. Are you able to identify them.

DR. GAWLIK: Yes, they have been identified already.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Very well.

H0960 – 0014

DR. GAWLIK: I shall first like to submit to you document PS 715 and document 723.

MAJOR MURRAY: As to No. 715, counsel for the Gestapo had already put the question to the witness, it seems to me.

DR. GAWLIK: Yes, but I have just one more question concerning this. The documents were submitted on 1 January 1946, and the place I referred to is on page 3276, and page 3277 of the German copy. My question is if in these documents concerning the SD, the "SD" is mentioned, or, is really the "SD" meant the Security Police?

THE WITNESS: Department IV is meant, that is the Security Police.

DR. GAWLIK: Thank you. On 25 January 1946, document F-567D, which I was not able to procure, was submitted. The places referred to are found on pages 3314 to 3316. In this document mention is supposed to be made of French civilians who were tortured in German police prisons in France by tortured instruments belonging to the SD. My question is -

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q Did the SD in France have any prisons?

A No.

Q Did the SD in France have any instruments of torture?

A I know nothing of it.

Q My next document is document F-571, page 23. In this document mention is made of the mistreatment or mal-treatment of a French National. The torturer mentioned here is called "Otto Bahrmann,DSD." Can you tell us whether this Otto Bahrmann was a member of the SD, or of another organization?

A I see from this document that the territory concerned is in northern France, and northern France was not under the jurisdiction of the military

H0960 - 0015

commander of Franc e.

DR GAWLIK: No further questions.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Any cross examination.

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY M. MONERRAY:

Q When did you enter the SD?

A In 1937.

Q Before, were you a member of the Party?

A Yes, since 1933.

Q Were you a member of the SS?

A No.

Q When did you get your rank of SS StandartenFuehrer and Obergruppen Fuehrer and so on?

A I think the rank I held was that of SS Starndartenfuehrer, which I received when I became chief of the Security Police, in May 1942.

Q When did you get your first rank as SS?

A When I entered the SD.

Q What did you do before entering into the SD?

A I was an editor, and before that I studied and entered my examination.

Q Where had you been an editor?

A I was editor with the student member in Berlin.

Q When you entered into the SD what was your first job?

A I worked in the Press Department of the SD, Department of Berlin.

Q When the SD main department was transferred into the RSHA, what was your position?

A I then became director of AMT VI.

H0960 - 0016

Q When was that?

A When it was created in 1939.

Q What was your exact position?

A I was in charge of the socalled Hauptabteilung Main Department.

Q What was the name of the Department?

A 6-H.

Q What was the function of 6-H?

A To draw up Intelligence Service abroad, and, above all to bring about connections with immigrant organizations.

Q And what for-this connection with immigrant organizations?

A In order to get intelligence concerning political developments abroad.

Q How long had you been chief of the 6-H?

A Until I was transferred to France.

Q You mean, until June 1940?

A Yes.

Q To this day you had no connection any more with AMT VI?

A Yes.

Q What sort of function?

A With AMT VI?

Q Yes?

A I concerned myself personally with the intelligence work in France, for the work that I did there was of an intelligence nature until May 1942.

H0960 - 0017

Q Reports were sent to Amt. 6?

A No, reports were also sent to Amt. 3, Amt. 7 and Amt. 4.

Q Where did you receive the directive to send your reports either to Amt. 3, Amt. 4,Amt. 6 or Amt. 7?

A According to the directives of the Reichs Security Main Office.

Q It was customary for the directives for the RSHA for SD members to send reports to the different departments of the RSHA was it not?

A The missions of the SD in France were not only missions that interested the Amt. 6 of the RSHA but missions which interested the RSHA in general.

Q I am asking you if directives existed giving you the necessary authority to send reports to Amt. 3,Amt. 4, Amt. 6 or Amt. 7. You can answer this question by "yes" or "no."

A Yes.

Q Can you tell me what kind of reports were to be sent to Amt. 4?

A Amt. 4 was to receive reports concerning communistic and leftist groups and also reports concerning the French police and general information on the French Police.

Q Why were the reports sent to Amt. 4 and not to Amt. 6?

A Since Amt. 4 was the central bureau for the evaluating of this intelligence.

Q In your capacity as a member of the SD, were you paid by the party or by the state?

A I believe I was paid by the party, but I don't know that exactly.

Q How long were you paid by the party?

A I don't know where the money I received came from. I always received my money from the RSHA. Idon't know if this money was taken

H0960-0018

from the party or the state.

Q Since June, 1940, you did not hold any official position at the RSHA, did you?

A No, but I was carried on the list of the RSHA.

Q What was the mission of 6-E?

A Do you mean what 6-E referred to in the years 1942 to 1944?

Q In 1941.

A I believe 6-E concerned itself with Italy.

Q The group in charge of the investigation of biological foes, was this Group 6-E?

A Yes, it may be that the name was afterwards 6-E.

Q Was there any connection between the different groups of Dept. 6 and Dept. 4 or was this connection only established by the distribution of the different reports and files?

A Yes, there was only a mutual exchange of documents and information and only then if Amt. 4 was interested.

Q There was no possibility for instance for Amt. 4 to give any direct orders to Amt. 6?

A Not as far as I know.

Q How can you explain that on the original organization's plan, the official chart of organization of the RSHA on January 1,1941, you are still called chief of Group 6-E of Dept. 66. You are SS Obersturmbannfuhrer Dr. Knochen, are you not?

A I already told you that I was still carried on the list of Department 6. I was officially represented there by someone because my work in France might just as well have only been of a temporary nature.

Q So, we can say that Group E is quite the same as Group A?

H0960 - 0019

A Yes.

Q On the general chart of organization, Document L-185, U.S. 484, it is indicated that as to Group 6-E, the chief of Dept. 4 has a special directive right, is that correct?

A Yes, but this right of directive could only be exercized via the chief of the Amt and would be used for example if a new mission or task resulted or was issued by Amt. 4, which Amt. 6 was supposed to carry out and which was of immediate interest to the chief of Amt. 4.

Q If we were to sum up this long lenthly answer, we can say,can we not, that this is cocrect that Amt. 4 has directive rights as to Group 6-E?

A No, this wording would mean that this group 6-E received direct orders andinstructions from Amt. 4.

Q What was the meaning of "special directive rights" of the chief of Amt. 4. It seems perfectly clear to me.

A This regulation is a "maybe" carried out regulation and it was not that all questions were to be decided with Amt. 4.

Q There was a direct connection between Amt. 4 and Amt. 6? Please answer "yes" or"no."

A I cannot answer the question in the negative or affirmative, because here this order does not mean a subordination to Amt. 4.

Q I did not ask you if there was a subordination or one or the other. I asked you only if there was a direct connection.

A I cannot answer this question by "yes" or "no."

DR. GAWLIK: The attorney is asking the witness to interpret a

H0960-0020

regulation and that is the business of the Tribunal

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: No. Please continue, Mr. Monneray

BY MR. MONNERAY:

Q It is not worth while to continue the discussion. The text is perfectly clear.

You told us during your direct examination by counsel that the RSHA was only of a personal union and there was no coordination between the several departments, did you not?

A I said that as far as my office as chief of the Security Police was concerned, it was only a personal union. I do not believe that the question concerned the RSHA.

Q According to your experiences in the office of the RSHA, there was a liaison between the different offices?

A Yes, of coursethere was a connection.

DR. GAWLIK: I would like to object to this question, as the witness has not been with the RSHA since 1940. He was in France and does not have the necessary knowledge to testify about this.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: The work that he was doing was so close to the RSHA, he must have known what was going on in the RSHA.

DR. GAWLIK: Then, I would like to have the question asked of the witness as to whether or not he has the necessary knowledge to testify.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: I would assume that he has the knowledge, in view of the work he was engaged in.

BY MR. MONNERAY: May I add that the witness told us of the different reports sent in Paris. It is quite obvious that the gentleman is aware

H0960 - 0021

of the activities of the RSHA.. The objections are purely technical.

Q Do you know what was the mission of Group 6-S.

A No, I could not define the missions of Group 6-S.

Q Have you known the witness, Dr. Sichs?

A Yes.

Q He was the chief of Department 7?

A Yes, until he was transferred to the foreign office, I believe?

Q Was he a member of the SD?

A Yes.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: We will have a recess for a few moments.

(THE COMMISSION RECESSED AND CONVENED AT 1600 HOURS.)

****

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: We can proceed.

BY MR. MONNERAY:

Q After you arrived in Paris in June, 1940, what was your official position?

A I was the co-worker of the Chief of Security Police for Belgium and France, Standartenfuehrer Thomas.

Q Did you arrive in Paris the same time as he?

A No, I arrived there later.

Q You arrived with the whole group, did you not?

A Yes.

Q Where did the members of this group come from?

A Most of the members of these groups came from the various departments of the RSHA.

Q Members of Amt. 3 and 6?

H0960 - 0022

A Yes, but also members of Amt. 4 and 7.

Q Did you arrive in SS uniforms or in the uniforms of the Geheime Feldpolizer?

A In the SS uniforms.

Q Did you have any difficulty on your arrival with the Army Command?

A Yes.

Q Why?

A The army command wished to have the secret military police increased, but he did not wish to have an SS Command. Apparently no clear instructions were issued to him.

Q Now, was Thomas the chief of this group?

A Yes.

Q When did you receive the title of Leiter de Dienstatelle Paris?

A This was no title representing a direct appointment. Thomas just told me that you are now going to manage this office in Paris?

Q Did this group work only in Paris, or all over the northern part of France?

A In Paris, then the subordinate office in Bordeaux, one in Dijon, one in Ronen, but the Dijon office belonged for a long time, I don't know the exact period, to Strassburg.

Q At this time did your Command constitute the whole organization of the Sipo and the SD in France?

A Individual deputies also arrived in France, there was for an example a special Criminal Police Commando that was sent to France. The mission of my Commando was onlyto safeguard the material in the different offices and organize them to carry out an intelligence evaluation of this material.

71

H0960 – 0023

Q You told us one of your missions was to pick up the former Austrian refugees living in France, did you not?

A No, later to find out what political aims and activities were being carred on with these different groups and organizations. Checking up on these individual refugees was one of the missions of a department of Amt. 4.

Q You told us before the recess that you sent your reports to the different departments of the RSHA in Berlin for Amts. 4, 6 and 7?

A Yes.

Q What kind of reports concerning what mateers were you sending to Berlin for instance for Department 4?

A The special consultant who was sent along for Amt. 4 had the various addresses needed, the department addresses for example of the different Socialist Party Offices, etc.

Q No only addresses of the organizations,but also addresses of the members of the organizations?

A If available there were also addresses of the leaders within these organizations.

Q Do you know what these reports contained?

A The material that was placed in the different offices was sorted according to different points of view. For example, memo programs, lecture reports, etc., which were of interest to other offices and organizations.

Q At the same time you tried to find or exploit the members of organizations of any kind, which seemed to be of interest to you?

A Yes.

H0960-0024

Q This material was then sent to the different departments, 3, 4, 6 and 7?

A Not allof the material that was of interest to France was sent to the Ministry Information of France.

Q Did you always cooperate closely with the military authorities? under the summer of 1942?

A Yes.

Q You never had any incident, nor might I say you don't remember any incident when the ministry command of France asked your Chief, Heydrick, to recall you?

A That must have been at the very beginning, but Heydrick immediately clarified this incident and after that no further incidents occured and when General Stupnagel left France I remember that I personally said goodby to him. All other subsequent commanders wore SS uniforms and not the uniforms of the Secret Military Police. This is one of the most important things of the issue.

Q How logg did you carry out your mission of research work of certain organizations?

A The time varied for the different sectors.

Q At the same time you were the chief of the Sipo and SD under General Thomas?

A There were no Secret Police measures connected with this, the only mission we had to concern ourselves with was one of an intelligence kind.

Q So you did not take any personal initiative before becoming commander of the Sipo and SD?

H0960 – 0025

A What do you mean by initiative?

Q You did not take any measures beyond this scope of pure abstract intelligence work?

A The Secret MilitaryPolice worked on the material that was necessary and any incidents that were to be carried out were then carried out by the Secret Military Police.

Q What did the members of the Gestapo do who were in your Command?

A They were working on the communistic and socialist organizations, in order to build up an intelligence service.

Q Did they hand over to the Military Police all information which seemed to make necessary an executive action?

A Yes, for they themselves were not allowed to take any executive action.

Q Did you promote any executive action to be carried out by French collaborators?

A In 1940 the collaborationist party groups wanted of their own accord to be very active, they did not have to be provoked to take any measures.

Q In 1941 did you direct any action of an executive kind?

A No, I don't remember any.

Q Do you remember one of your co-workers, SS Abesturmfuhrer Sommer?

A Yes.

Q Was he recalled to Berlin at the end of October, 1941?

A Yes.

H0960 - 0026

Q Do youremember the reason for this?

A Sommer had worked with such an active French Group and of his own accord had such a connection.

Q But, he did not act under your orders and you did not act under the orders of Heydrick?

A Yes, certainly I was under Heydrick's orders by his Deputy Thomas.

Q Was Sommer a member of the SD?

A Yes.

Q Do you remember the blowing up of seven or eight synagogues in Paris in October of 1941.

A Not seven or eight, I remember one.

Q On the 2nd and 3rd of October there were plots carried out with explosives against seven synagogues and you sent very large reports on this to the Military Command. Do you remember that?

A Yes, but I don't remember that number.

Q Do you remember that those plots had been organized by Sommer, with him working under your orders?

A I did not have any orders.

Q Please answer "yes" or "no."

A I remember that Sommer was concerned in this action.

Q You do not remember that Sommer told the Military investigators that he acted according to your orders. Please answer first by "yes" or "no."

A Yes, he did so because otherwise he probably would not have been released by the military authorities.

Q Do you remember that you sent a report to the Military Command,

H0960 - 0027

telling him that those plots were due to a sort of a spontaneous outbreak of the anti-Jewish passion of the French people, whereas you knew already that Sommer had organized these plots. Do you remember this report? Please answer "yes" or"no" if you remember this report, afterward you can explain.

A I don't remember the report in detail.

Q Do you remember the report itself?

A I know that the report was made to the Military Command at that time.

Q Did you report it to the military command?

A No, I don't remember that.

Q Is it correct that you had a conversation with Sommer about this project of blowing up these synagogues?

A No, I don't remember.

Q It seems advisable to show you the value of your whole testimony. I submit as evidence Document PS 1629, which should be given an Exhibit Number by this Commission. I read to you a letter of October 4, 1941, signed by yourself. I quote:

TOP SECRET

Annex 5
to 1 c 464/41 top secret
of 6.10.41

COPY

The Deputy of the Chief of the Security Police
and of the Security Service for
Belgium and France.
Paris Bureau

Paris, October 4th 1941

H0960-0028

Com.A.
Take 4-Pg. 12
Meehan
14 June.

Subject: Bomboutrage against Paris synagogues during the night of 2/3-10-1941

Reference: Report of 3.10.41

During the police investigations by the French authorities, I was able to obtain a first picture of public opinion:

1. The opinion most often heard is that the attacks were planned by the Jews themselves in order to create a feeling of compassion for thesemselves amongst the broad masses of the people. Many Frenchmen even go so far as to consider the French political police as the instigators, and to assume that the Chief of Cabinet of the Paris Prefect of Police Dallier is the authoritative liaison officer between Jewish capitol and the executive offices. This latter interpretation is principally represented in newspaper circles.

2 The French Police on the other hand declare that only DELONCLE would be responsible for such organized outrages.

3 One often hears that version which says that this is a purely "Jewish Business", intended to switch the occurence into the religious-domain, and thereby to stir up agitation against the Germans and the "anti-Jewish laws inspired by them."

4 That which is stated in 3 coincides or rather is proved by those, though isolated-, voices the origin of which probably lies with the Jews themselves, which declares that at the time in question(between 205 o'clock) nobody could be in the streets except the Germans. Even if it could not be said with resolute certainty that the instigators were Germans; one thing was in any case certain, that there was noquestion of Frenchmen having perpetrated these deeds.

After the rumor had spread in Paris in the early morning hours of 2.10.1941 that the English had dropped bombs, this error was cleared up

27

H0960-0029

in the course of the day when it gradually became known that apparently only synagogues were hit. The press reports in the evening helped to clarify the situation further.

Young people particularly hailed the fact warmly that at least something forcible had been undertaken against the Jews, without seriously taking into consideration the possible men behind perpretrators. In the circle of the Anti-Jewish institute the point of view was taken that it was a good thing to give the Jews a public reminder, and, with regard to the perpretators, inclined toward the interpretations as given in 1.

A further report will follow in due course."

Witness, did you listen to the reading of this letter?

A Yes.

Q Do you remember now?

A Yes, I remember the events.

Q You remember now that you were in touch with Sommer and acted according to higher orders?

A I don't remember how it was. Sommer returned to France later.

Q I did not ask you if Sommer was in France afterwards. I asked if you, not Sommer, talked over the matter and acted under superior orders?

A I did not give any instructions. This affair must have been managed by Berlin, I don't know upon whose suggestion.

Q I will read you an extract of the report of the German Military Command. It is a letter sent to the Chief of Police in Berlin:

~~"The result of these investigations disclosed:~~

~~1) The bomb outrages on synagogues in Paris were carried out by French-~~

H0960 -0030

"The plots were executed by Frenchmen belonging to the Deloncle groups. The explosives were procured by SS-2nd Lieutenant Sommer from Berlin and delivered to the offenders. SS-2nd Lieutenant Sommer was informed of the time of the attacks and was in company of the offenders directly before the attacks.

SS-2nd Lieutenant Sommer acted on the order of the Chief of the Paris-branch of the Security Police and of the Security Service, SS-Lieutenant Colonel Dr. Knochen, who - according to the enclosed copy of his report to the Militarycommander of 4 October 1941 wrongly described these attacks as a 'purely French affairs'".

Have you anything to say to this?

A If Sommer had done this at my order, he would not have received the explosives for example from Berlin. It would have been impossible to carry out such an order for such an action simply on my order.

Q Is it correct that you left Paris immediately after those plots, in order to go to Berlin, do you remember?

A I don't remember.

Q I want to read to you the letter sent from Heydrick to the Military Command of France:

"To the explanations about the explosion plots carried out against 7 Paris synagogues in the night of 2 to 3 October by Frenchmen with the knowledge of the Director of the Paris Agency of my task force detachment, I am taking the following stand:

"The plots of sabotage which was carried out war-industrial facilities, the acts of sabotage against railroad transports, the assassination atempts on members of the German armed forces and the attempted assassination of French

H0960 - 0031

politicians, who openly took a stand for a German French collaboration showed Jewish Communist circles to be the instigator of all these crimes. The German authorities in Paris, as well as the press at that time, pointed out again and again that Jews and Communists are the instigators of the detonatinn plots and assassination attempts. The political situation made it appear appropfiate that aside from the punishments which was handed out it must be shown to the French public and the world public that within the French people there are also forces which are not only prepared to fight Bolshevism but also publicly to attack Jewry which was formerly so powerful in Paris.

On the part of my agency, liaison had also been established with French anti Semitic groups in the work against international Jewry. The anti-Semitic group of Deloncle was in this respect even formerly known as the most active, whereby DELONCLE - with all reservations because of his otherwise political unpredictability - gave the best guarantee for an uncompromising fight against Jewry. DELONCLE declared for himself thathe was ready to carry out reprisal measures against Jewry as the instigators of the attempted plots. His suggestions were accept by me only at the moment when Jewry was being ear marked with allseverity even by highest authorities as the responsbble arsonist in Europe, who must once and for all disappear in Europe.

The explosion plots against 7 Paris synagogues which were carried out in one night were also a sign for France that Jewry can no longer feel secure in its former European center. All French circles understood this. No doubt could ever arise that these measures are directed exclusively against Jewry; but not against the German Wehrmacht which will never guard or protect Jewish Synagogues. That German offices had knowledge of the plot

H0960 - 0032

has until now nowhere become known to the French population.

"Due to the peculiarity of the measures to be carried out, the Director of my Paris office did not notify the Commander in Chief, since, on the basis of previous experiences in working together with the Commander in Chief, one could hardly count on the necessary understanding for the necessity of executing these measures in the controversies with world philosophical opponents. Due to the special circumstances of the task he therefore also reported later on what public opinion actually was. I was fully aware of the political importance of the measures adopted especially since for years I have been commissioned to prepare the final solution of the Jewish problem in Europe, I also accept the responsibility for it. According to the reports at hand before me, the injuries of the members of the German Wehrmacht, as a result of the explosion plot, were fortunately not considerable.

For further utilization of my former deputy for Belgium and France, I inform you that SS Brigadefuehrer Dr. Thomas already received from me on 29 September 1941 a new assignment within the scope of the Security Police detailed in the East, which anyhow would not have permitted further utilization in France. For inner-departmental reasons, I summond SS Obersturmfuehrer Sommer to Berlin. The director of the Paris office, SS Obersturnbannfuehrer Dr. Knochen acted according to the orders given to him. So far there has been no objection to his work in France, so that I shall continue to keep him in the post as director of the special task detachment in France with the Paris office."

Q You acted according to the orders of Heydrick and those plots were within the scope of the tasks of your commands in Paris. Is this correct?

H0960 - 0033

A No.

Q So you claim that the letter of the Chief of the Sipo and SD is not according to the truth and does not give the exact definition of your tasks in France, do you?

A No, but the report is not related exactly as the affair was. The affair was ordered by Berlin without my being concerned in it andas the letter discloses that Sommer was being recalled to Berlin and I was to remain in the office, this fact shows that I did not have a hand in it as you assume.

Q Do you deny having made this report?

A I certainly did not make this report myself.

Q Did you sign it?

A I must have signed it for it is signed Dr. Knochen.

Q Did you meet Sommer before the plot and did you talk with him about this question. Please answer first "yes" or "no". It is perfectly possible to say "yes" or "no" in answer to the question if someone has met someone or not. Answer these two questions. Did you meet Sommer before the execution of this plot and secondly, did you talk over with him the matter of the plots against the synagogues?

A I met Sommer, but I did not discuss this plot with him.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: We will adjourn until Monday at 1000 hours.

(THE COMMISSION ADJOURNED AT 1700 HOURS.)

****

H0960 - 0034

The foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the testimony of HELMUT KNOCHEN, taken on 14 June 1946

Charles J. Gallagher
Reporter pp 1-15

Alice Mahan
Reporter 16-32

CERTIFIED TO :

Joseph F. Tubridy
Commissioner

Commiossioner

H0960 - 0035

AFTERNOON SESSION

(The hearing reconvened at 1400 hours, 14 June 1946)

HELMUT KNOCHEN, Recalled.
DIRECT EXAMINATION - continued.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Will you remind the witness he is still under oath.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

DR. MERKEL: I have questions to put to the witness for about another half an hour.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Very well.

BY DR. MERKEL:

Q I wish first of all the witness to voice his opinion concerning document RF 1224, which is along the general lines concerning the big action against the Parisian Jews.

A This document is known as the Dannecker concerning actions against Jews in Paris. This document proves that Dannecker special commission worked independently, and the practical carrying out of this order was in the hands of the French police.

Q Could one draw out of this a conclusion that your Security Police Group stationed in any part of the Security Service of the SD in France had participated in same?

A No, this could prove that Dannecker was in connection with the French Police independently, and that the carrying out of the order was largely in the hands of the French Police.

Q The prosecution might frequently mention certain transport of Jews, prisoners, or workers from France into Germany. Who was responsible for these transports?

A This Dannecker Commission also was in charge of these transports.

Q The transportation of Jews?

A Yes.

Q Any other cases?

A Concerning the work prisoners, they were transported to the railroad station Compaigne by the military groups, or the military corps, and from there were taken over by units of the Order Police. These Order Police were under the chief of the Order Police.

Q Now one more question concerning the shooting of hostages, and the

H0960-0036

prosecution claims that a large number of hostages were shot; among other things, in Paris the number 11,000 shootings is mentioned. What do you know concerning this?

A I believe that this number is much too high. I only know concerning the shootings in1940, and 1942, and I cannot remember the exact number. However, I say that this number was much too high.

Q Can you give your opinion about the approximate number?

A I do believe previously that after the Superior SS and Police Leader was named, that there was about three of these reprisal measures, and in the course of this period about 180 to 190 people were shot. If you had to complete that number of people shot previously, that is, 1940 to '42, then you will come to a number in my opinion of about 700, or as high as 800.

Q How do you explain this evident difference between the number of prosecution of 11,000 and your statement?

MAJOR MURRAY: Just a moment, the witness testified he did not know how many were shot, and now he is asked can he explain the difference between the numbers he know that were shot and the report of 11,000 that were shot. It is entirely immaterial.

DR. MERKEL: I am sure the witness can answer whether during this period other people were added both not only killed and not shot as reprisal measures, but during combat, or some kind of fighting?

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Do you know how the prosecution arrived at this figure of 11,000 people?

THE WITNESS: No.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Then I do not believe the witness will be able to explain further on that point.

BY DR. MERKEL:

Q I now present to you the document PS-715, R 294, concerning measures against French Officers, which were carried out with the approval of the German Embassy, the SIPO, and the SD?

A This document proves that the highest offices evidently ordered to have arrested who were French officers; the Commander in Chief West was supposed to prepare such a list. In preparing this list the commander in chief of the army was represented as well as the commanders . . . .

H0960 – 0037

of the Navy, or Airforce, and also was a representative of the Commander in Chief West. The Security Police also took part in preparing this list. This document proves that there was no overall General West, but that all material was formally before that checked thoroughly by all officers concerne It was unquestionably pointed out that the various specific points were brought out by these various organizations in order to carry out this measure. Therefore, proof that this was hot a rush action but that of points of view, and that the guilt of the persons concerned was checked thoroughly before.

H0960 - 0038

Q I shall now submit document 7913, RF 422 to say about German soldiers, the Gestapo, and officials are mentioned in this document who arrested people in Oyonnax. Were there any offices of Security Police and SD in this town at all?

A I do not know that there was an office of this Security Police and the SD in Oyonnax, it was probably a very small town, and the document mentioned this in the occupation of the German troops. Mention is also made of the fact that the town was shelled. This points towards a military action.

Q When you were interrogated by the defense counsel of the SD on the war diary of Potrovsky, and submitted document 7257, RF 405, you said, when you were interrogated, that the mention that was made of the SD in this document several times was to be considered as being meant to be Security Police. Do you mean to say that the measures described in this document are to be considered measures taken by the Security Police.

A I want to point out that the members who had taken part in the mentioned military actions here could not have been members of Department III, but must have been members of Department IV, which saw to the carrying out actions against resistant movements. The participation of those members of the Security Police was ordered by the General Staff France in Lyons. If I remember the real diary showed the two generals were commissioned with carrying out these measures in order to bring about once more peace and order in southern France. This was a military action in which troops and airforce took part. The part that the members of the Security Police had in this action was an infinitesimal one under the leadership of Hauptsturmbannfuehrer Geissler in order to support Demartment IC. At the same time the military intelligence staff of IC had also been made to do so. The members of the Security Police were used to carry out interrogations, and by means of these interrogations to find out new groups of terrorists.

Q The French Prosecution submitted a report for war prisoners, and for people concerning the forces of evacuation, and mutual treatment of prisoners of war. I want to read a few short passages to you on page 626 of the German document. Registrations are spoken of that were carried out in order to seize the men who were liable to labor service.

H0960-0039

M. MONNERAY: Pardon me, what number is that?

DR. MERKEL: The document has no number. It was just mentioned once during the interrogation but was not submitted as an exhibit.

M. MONNERAY: It has not been in court.

DR. MERKEL: I don't think so.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: May we see it, please (Present document to the Commissioner).

BY DR. MERKEL:

Q Was this registration of people who were liable for labor service one of the tasks of the Security Police?

A No, the Security Police had nothing to do with the registration and rounding up of people liable for labor service. Department III only made general reports on the effects of labor employment. No department of the Security Police had anything to do with putting this into effect.

Q On page 715, executions in the woods of Robinson is mentioned. Do you know anything about such executions carried out there by Security Police?

A No, I know nothing about this.

Q In the last quote from this document on page 716 it says: "The Department W in France has a department which has the greatest number of people which had been tortured; the time was begun in the year of 1944, and that a long chain of massacres for the Germans no longer try to disguise the executions behind the mass of orderly triumphs." What can you as Chief of the Security Police in France say to this?

A The large number of dead people, and the numerous number of small villages mentioned shows also that there was no offices in the Security Police in any of these small villages, and the time during which these actions, or events took place were shortly before, during and after the invasion, and were as part of military measures. I should also like to point out that during the time of the invasion the offices of the Security Police in this department were not staffed with additional personnel. The victims mentioned here must be victims of military measures taken in order to protect the troops, and probably carried out by terrorists behind the front.

Q A further mention is made of the Gestapo prison in Bonscat, and likewise,

H0960 — 0040

mention is made of the Gestapo prison in Merignac. Were there any offices of the Security Police in either of these places?

Q I never heard of these places mentioned as seats of a Security Police or SD office. At best there were only very small offices in the capitals of the departments, but not every capital of a department had such SD or Security Police office. Only in a very few border towns were there any headquarters of the frontier police. That is, towns which were not capitals of a department.

Q In this document mention is made of several people, and two of them were ont Poinsot, and the other Cilerier, who had been arrested and killed, and were listed French Nationals. Do you know whether these people mentioned were members of the Security Police and the SD, or of the French

Police ?

M. MONERRAY : May I interrupt again and find out what document he speaks about ?

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY : Yes.

DR. MERKEL : This is document also that has no number, which was submitted with a number of other documents as a group.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY : Well, Dr. Merkel, you appreciate that when one is reading the record one can not tell what is being referred to, unless you identify the paper in some way so that the record can show that these papers are when the record is being read.

DR. MERKEL : Would it be agreable if I gave this document a number and I will present it today.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY : No. If they had not been already submitted, we would like to know what they are, if you could give the date and have them submitted, and also the page numbers and the heading. If they have been submitted we would like to be able to identify them by number so there is some way of knowing what they are.

H0960 - 0041

M. MONERRAY : I think I have it.

DR. MERKEL : So far as I know the document was submitted with a group of other documents in court.

M. MONERRAY : I think it is part of a document put into evidence, and it is only one half of it, and the document is F 561. I wonder if this document has been translated into the four languages. If not, I don't think it is in evidence even though it has been read. I think it would be advisable to check out F 561 to see if it has been given an RF exhibit number.

DR. MERKEL : It is RF 306.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY : You are referring to the first page ?

DR. MERKEL : Yes, the first page.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY : Could we have that document here identified before the witness is asked to testify concerning it, so when we read the record we will be able to know to what you refer.

BY DR. MERKEL :

Q Do you remember my question ?

A Yes. By the names I know they can only be Frenchmen. I have had no one with the Security Police with those names. I remember that the name Poinsot was

mentioned once by the French Police. A certain Poinsot was to receive a function with the police in Vichy, but he had not been in Vichy up to that time. I do not know if that same man is the man or not.

Q On page 2 is mentioned a sergeant who split a prisoner's head by means of a key during interrogations. Can you tell us whether this man was a member of the Security Police.

A This man was evidently a member of the Army, who belonged to the guard personnel of the army, detention institution, for mention is made here that a certain "H" was the place concerned.

Q I shall submit another document to you, C-45. This document is a regulation concerning the combatant fight against terrorist.

A This is an order of the Commander in Chief West concerning the right against terrorist, and this order shows and you can see that is his command for the army, and shows further that the security of the troops has been so endangered by the terrorist that police measures are evidently no longer counted on, and the troops are to take their own actions. This condition was not the same in all the districts, but in some districts the army troops were so much endangered that communications could no longer be sustained between two offices, if a number of cars or convoys did not keep up the communications together.

MAJOR MURRAY : One moment. If I remember this document was handed to this man, and he was not asked a question about it. He appearently was told what was in the document, and the Commission can not tell what is in the document without his helping out.

DR. MERKEL : The question was to read the order. The order concerned the SD here, and to see whether the Security Police, or the Security Service had any hands in these matters, and I would like the witness to answer that question.

MAJOR MURRAY : I believe you can determine that from the document itself. You do not need help from this Gestapo witness to read the order.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY : May I see the document please. Is it in German ?

THE INTERPRETER : Yes, sir. (Whereupon same read to the Commission).

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY : I think that is the proper question.

BY DR. MERKEL :

Q Will you answer the question.

H0960-0042

A This order shows that the Security Police was not asked to take any part in the investigations concerning the situations, and measures mentioned here, but was only informed afterwards after skirmishes and actions had already taken place. The same was true of the military commander in chief who was also informed only afterwards.

Q Was it one of the means, did it belong to the work or aims, tasks and measures of the activities of the Security Police and SD in France to take Jews out of concentration camps and also to take out political enemies from prisoner of war camps.

H0960 - 0043

H0960 - 0044

Q To such camps in order to execute them?

A No, I know of no case where the Security Police was employed in such actions.

Q The defense counsel for the SD has already submitted the (German) "Decree Bulletin" PS 1650. Did the Security Police in France have any hand in this measure?

A No.

Q Why not?

A From the contents of the document which was submitted to me here, which is proof that this decree would have had no basis at all in France.

Q Similarly, the Field Commando Order 498-P S was submitted to you. Did the Security Police in France have any hand in the execution of commando members, or parachutists, or were these measures not carried out?

A The directives given France concerning this Commando Order was that parachutists were to remain with the troops, or handed over to the troops. This means that parachutists in uniform were always, if they had fallen into the hands of the Security Police, were handed over immediately to the nearest airforce station.

Q I shall like to submit the document that is already handed to you, C-176,DB 228, concerning executions in Bordeaux. Who executed these people in Bordeaux?

A The Navy executed these commandos in Bordeaux.

Q Were the Security Police in France used to carry out the so-called "Nacht und Nebel Erlass" document L-90?

A P ractical execution of this decree had already been put into effect before the higher Police SS and Leadership office was instituted. The Sr. Judge decided as to whether the prisoner was to be handed over as a "Night and fog prisoner." When the office of the higher SS and Police Leader was instituted the Security Police only continued to carry out the work which formerly had to be carried out by the Secret Field Police. The Security

H0960 – 0045

Police took over the prisoner termed as "A night and fog prisoner" by the Sr. Judge, and caused him to be transported to a Gestapo office within the Reich, which so far as I know was in Cologne.

Q This also claims that members of the Gestapo and SD arrested Foreign Internationalists, and punished and sentenced them by summary court trials. Were such trials carried out in France?

A I only know that such arrests took place when the persons concerned had committed offenses against the regulations of the occupying power; or, if they were suspected of having attached with a group that had taken action against, or intended to take action against the occupying power. The disciplinary measures that I know of were only measures ordered by the RSHA, the protective custody, by a military court trial.

Q Did cases of family or clan arrests occur within the area of the commander in France?

A I remember that immediately after the institution of the higher SS and Police Leader a yellow poster was published threatening that family members of a person who had fled, after committing an offense, would also be arrested. I know nothing, however, of a practical execution of this order. In order to carry this measure out, it would have had to be necessary to locate the members of his family, and considering the very small [illegible], this was practically impossible.

Q Were inmates of detention institutions in France murdered by the Security Police in order to prevent their liberation by the Allies?

A I know nothing of this. The settling of prisoner questions was regulated by the military commander in chief at the beginning of the invasion, or rather before the invasion took place. I already mentioned that the Army detention institutes had always been under the supervision guarding and maintenance of the military administration. This state of affairs remained until the very end, and as such the evacuation, detention build-

H0960 -0046

ings, and prisons were the concern of the military administration.

Q Do you know anything about the confiscation or plundering of public property, especially, Jewish property in France?

A No, I do not remember any cases, because all confiscations had to be carried out by the military administration.

Q Was there any persecution of the churches by the Security Police while you were in France?

A No.

DR. MERKEL: No further questions.

DR. GAWLIK: I would like to submit four documents to the witness which I have just now received.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: What documents are they.

DR. GAWLIK: The SD.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Have they been submitted by the prosecution?

DR. GAWLIK: Yes.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Very well. Are you able to identify them?

DR. GAWLIK: Yes, they have been identified already.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: Very well.

H0960 - 0047

DR. GAWLIK: I shall first like to submit to you document PS 715 and document 723.

MAJOR MURRAY: As to No. 715, counsel for the Gestapo had already put the question to the witness, it seems to me.

DR. GAWLIK: Yes, but I have just one more question concerning this. The documents were submitted on 1 January 1946, and the place I referred to is on page 3276, and page 3277 of the German opy. My question is if in these documents concerning the "SD" is mentioned, or, is really the "SD" meant for the Security Police?

THE WITNESS: Department IV is meant, that is the Security Police.

DR. GAWLIK: Thank you. On 25 January 1946, document F-567D, which I was not able to procure, was submitted. The places referred to are found on pages 3314 to 3316. In this document mention is supposed to be made of French civilians who were tortured in German police prisons in France by tortured instruments belonging to the SD. My question is --

BY DR. GAWLIK:

Q Did the SD in France have any prisons?

A No.

Q Did the SD in France have any instruments of torture?

A I know nothing of it.

Q My next document is document F-571, page 23. In this document mention is made of the mistreatment or mal-treatment of a French National. The torturer mentioned here is called "Otto Bahrmann, DSD." Can you tell us whether this Otto Bahrmann was a member of the SD, or of another organization?

A I see from this document that the territory concerned is in northern France, and northern France wasnot under the jurisdiction of the military commander of France.

DR. GAWLIK: No further questions.

CAPTAIN TURNBULL: Any cross examination?

CROSS EXAMINATION

BY M. MONERRAY:

Q When did you enter the SD?

A In 1937.

H0960-0048

Q Before, were you a member of the Party?

A Yes, since 1933.

Q Were you a member of the SS?

A No.

Q When did you get your rank of SS Standartenfuehrer and Obergruppen-

führer and so on?

A I think the rank I held was that of SS Standartenfuehrer, which I received when I became chief of the Security Police, in May 1942.

Q When did you get your first rank as SS?

A When I entered the SD.

Q What did you do before entering the SD?

A I was an editor, and before that I studied and entered my examination.

Q Where had you been an editor?

A I was editor with the student member in Berlin.

Q When you entered into the SD what was your first job?

A I worked in the Press Department, of the SD, Department of Berlin.

Q When the SD main department was transferred into the RSHA, what was your position?

A I then became director of Amt VI.

Q When was that?

Q What was your exact position?

A I was in charge of the so-called Haputabteilung Main Department.

Q What was the name of the Department?

A 6-H.

Q What was the function of 6-H?

A To draw up Intelligence Service abroad, and, above all to bring about connections with immigrant organizations.

Q And what for---this connection with immigrant organizations?

A In order to get intelligence concerning political developments abroad.

Q How long had you been chief of the 6-H?

A Until I was transferred to France.

H0960 — 0049

Q You mean, until June 1940?

A Yes.

Q To this day you had no connection any more with Amt VI.

A Yes.

Q What sort of function?

A With Amt VI?

Q Yes.

A I concerned myself personally with the intelligence work in France, for the work that I did there was of an intelligence nature until May 1942.

H0960-0050

Q Reports were sent to Amt. 6?

A No, reports were also sent to Amt. 3, Amt. 7 and Amt. 4.

Q Where did you receive the directive to send your reports either to Amt. 3, Amt. 4, Amt. 6 or Amt. 7?

A According to the directives of the Reichs Security Main Office.

Q It was customary for the directives for the RSHA for SD members to send reports to the different departments of the RSHA, was it not?

A The missions of the SD in France were not only missions that interested the Amt. 6 of the RSHA but missions which interested the RSHA in general.

Q I am asking you if directives existed giving you the necessary authority to send reports to Amt. 3, Amt. 4, Amt. 6 or Amt. 7. You can answer this question by "yes" or "no."

A Yes.

Q Can you tellme what kind of reports were to be sent to Amt. 4?

A Amt. 4 was to receive reports concerning communistic and leftist groups and also reports concerning the French police and general information on the French Police.

Q Why were the reports sent to Amt. 4 and not to Amt. 6?

A Since Amt. 4 was the central bureau for the evaluating of this intelligence.

Q In your capacity as a member of the SD, were you paid by the party or by the state?

A I believe I was paid by the party, but I don't know that exactly.

Q How long were you paid by the party?

A I don't know where the money I received came from. I always received my money from the RSHA. I don't know if this money was taken from the party or the state.

Q Since June, 1940, you did not hold any official position in the RSHA, did you?

A No, but I was carried on the list of the RSHA.

Q What was the mission of 6-E?

A Do you mean what 6-E referred to in the years 1942 to 1944?

Q In 1941.

A [illegible]

H0960-0051

A I believe 6-E concerned itself with North Italy.

Q The group in charge of the investigation of Belgian affairs, was Group 6-E?

A Yes, it may be that the name was afterwards 6-E.

Q Was there a connection between the different groups of Dept. 6 or Dept. 4 or was this connection only established by the distribution of the different reports and files?

A Yes, there was only a mutual exchange of documents and information and only then if Amt. 4 was interested.

Q There was no possibility for instance for Amt. 4 to give any direct orders to Amt. 6?

A Not as far as I know.

Q How can you explain that on the original organization's plan, the official chart of organization of the RSHA on January 1, 1941, you are still called chief of Group 6-E of Dept. 6. You are SS Obersturmbannfuehrer Dr. Hochen, are you not?

A I already told you that I was still carried on the list of Amt 6. I was officially represented there by someone because my work there might just as well have only been of a temporary nature.

Q So, we can say that Group E is quite the same as Group A?

A Yes.

Q On the general chart of organization, Document L-185, U.S. 484, it is indicated that as to Group 6-E, the chief of Dept. 4 has a special directive right, is that correct?

A Yes, but this right of directive could only be exercised via the chief of the Amt and would be used, for example, if a new mission or task resulted or was issued by Amt. 4, which Amt. 6 was supposed to carry out and which was of immediate interest to the chief of Amt. 4.

Q If we were to sum up this long lengthly answer, we can say, can we not, that this is correct that Amt. 4 has directive rights as to Group 6-E?

A No, this wording would mean that this group 6-E received direct orders and instructions from Amt. 4.

Q What was the meaning of "special directive rights" of the chief Amt. 4. It seems perfectly clear to me.

H0960-0052

A This regulation is a "maybe" carried out regulation and it was not that all questions were to be decided with Amt. 4.

Q There was a direct connection between Amt. 4 and Amt. 6? Please answer "yes" or "no."

A I cannot answer the question in the negative or affirmative, because here this order does not mean a subordination to Amt. 4.

Q I did not ask you if there was a subordination or one or the other. I asked you only if there was a direct connection.

A I cannot answer this question by "yes" or "no."

DR. GAWLIK: The attorney is asking the witness to interpret a regulation and that is the business of the Tribunal.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: No. Please continue, Mr. Monneray.

BY MR. MONNERAY:

Q It is not worth while to continue the discussion. The text is perfectly clear.

You told us during your direct examination by counsel that the RSHA was only of a personal union and there was no coordination between the several departments, did you not?

A I said that as far as my office as chief of the Security Police was concerned, it was only a personal union. I do not believe that the question concerned the RSHA.

Q According to your experiences in the office of the RSHA, there was a liaison between the different offices?

A Yes, of course there was a connection.

DR. GAWLIK: I would like to object to this question, as the witness has not been with the RSHA since 1940. He was in France and does not have the necessary knowledge to testify about this.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: The work that he was doing was so close to the RSHA, he must have known what was going on in the RSHA.

DR. GAWLIK: Then, I would like to have the question asked of the witness as to whether or not he has the necessary knowledge to testify.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: I would assume that he has the knowledge, in view of the work he was engaged in.

BY M. MONNERAY: May I add that the witness told us of the different reports sent in Paris. It is quite obvious that the gentleman is aware

H0960-0053

of the actities of the RSHA . The objections are purely technical.

Q Do you know what was the mission of Group 6-S.

A No, I could not define the missions of Group 6-S.

Q Have you known the witness, Dr. Sichs?

A Yes.

Q He was the chief of Department 7?

A Yes, until he was transferred to the foreign office, I believe?

Q Was he a member of the SD?

A Yes.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: We will have a recess for a few minutes.

(THE COMMISSION RECESSED AND CONVENED AT 1600 HOURS.)

****

BY M. MONNERAY:

Q After you arrived in Paris in June, 1940, what was your official position?

A I was the co-worker of the Chief of Security Police for Belgium and France, Standartenfuehrer Thomas.

Q Did you arrive in Paris the same time as he?

A No, I arrived there later.

Q You arrived with the whole group, did you not?

A Yes.

Q Where did the members of this group come from?

A Most of the members of these groups came from the various departments of the RSHA.

Q Members of Amt 3 and 6?

A Yes, but also members of Amt 4 and 7.

Q Did you arrive in SS uniforms or inthe uniforms of the Geheime Feldpolizer?

A In the SS uniforms.

Q Did you have any difficulty on your arrival with the Army Command?

A Yes.

Q Why?

A The army command wished to have the secret military police increased, but he did not wish to have an SS Command. Apparently no clear instructions

H0960-0054

were issued to him.

Q Now, was Thomas the chief of this group?

A Yes.

Q When did you receive the title of Leiter de Dienstatelle Paris?

A This was no title representing a direct appointment. Thomas just told me that you are now going to manage this office in Paris?

Q Did this group work only in Paris, or all over the northern part of France?

A In Paris, then the subordinate office in Bordeaux, one in Dijon, one in Renon, but the Dijon office belonged for a long time, I don't know the exact period, to Strassburg.

Q At this time did your Command constitute the whole organization of the Sipo and the SD in France?

A Individual deputies also arrived in France, there was for an example a special Criminal Police Commando that was sent to France. The mission of my Commando was only to safeguard the material in the different offices and organize them to carry out an intelligence evaluation of this material.

Q You told us one of your missions was to pick up the former Austrian refugee living in France, did you not?

A No, later to find out what political aims and activities were being carried on with these different groups and organizations. Checking up on these individual refugees was one of the missions of a department of Amt 4.

Q You told us before the recess that you sent your reports to the different departments of the RSHA in Berlin for Amts 4, 6 and 7?

A Yes.

Q What kind of reports concerning what matters were you sending to Berlin for instance for Department 4?

A The special consultant who was sent along for Amt 4 had the various addresses needed, the department addresses for example of the different Socialist Party Offices, etc.

Q Not only addresses of the organizations, but also addresses of the members of the organizations?

A If available there were also addresses of the leaders within these

H0960-0055

organizations.

Q Do you know what these reports contained?

A The material that was placed in the different offices was sorted according to different points of view. For example, memo programs, lecture reports, etc., which were of interest to other offices and organizations.

Q At the same time you tried to find or exploit the members of organizations of any kind, which seemed to be of interest to you?

A Yes.

H0960-0056

Q. This material was then sent to the different department, 3, 4, 6 and 7?

A. Not all of the material that was of interest to France was sent to the Ministry Information of France.

Q. Did you always cooperate closely with the military authorities?

A. Yes.

Q. You never had any incident, nor might I say you don't remember any incident when the ministry command of France asked your Chief, Heydrich, to recall you?

A. That must have been at the very beginning, but Heydrich immediately clarified this incident, and after that no further incidents occured and when General Stupnagel left France, I remember that I personally said goodbye to him. All other subsequent commanders wore SS uniforms and not the uniforms of the Secret Military Police. This is one of the most important things of the issue.

Q. How long did you carry out your mission of research work of certain organizations?

A. The time varied for the different sectors.

Q. At the same time you were the chief of the Sipo and SD under General Thomas?

A. There were no Secret Police measures connection with this, the only mission we had to concern ourselves with was one of an intelligence kind.

Q. So you did not take any personal initiative before becoming commander of the Sipo and SD?

A. What do you mean by initiative?

Q. You did not take any measures beyond this scope of pure abstract intelligence work?

A. The Secret Military Police worked on the material that was necessary and any incidents that were to be carried out were then carried out by the Secret Military Police.

Q. What did the members of the Gestapo do who were in your Command?

H0960-0057

A. They were working on the communistic and socialist organizations, in order to build up an intelligence service.

Q. Did they hand over to the Military Police all information which seemed to make necessary an executive action?

A. Yes, for they themselves were not allowed to take any executive action.

Q. Did you promote any executive action to be carried out by French collaborators?

A. In 1940 the collaborationist party groups wanted, of their own accord, to be very active, they did not have to be provoked to take any measures.

Q. In 1941 did you direct any action of an executive kind?

A. No, I don't remember any.

Q. Do you remember one of your co-workers, SS Abosturmfuhrer Sommer?

A. Yes.

Q. Was he recalled to Berlin at the end of October 1941?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you remember the reason for this?

A. Sommer had worked with such an active French Group, and of his own accord had such a connection.

Q. But, he did not act under your orders, and you did not act under the orders of Heydrich?

A. Yes, certainly I was under Heydrich's order by his deputy, Thomas.

Q. Was Sommer a member of the SD?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you remember the blowing up of seven or eight synagogues in Paris in October 1941.

A. Not seven or eight, I remember one.

Q. On the 2nd and 3rd of October there were plots carried out with explosives against seven synagogues, and you sent a very large reports on this to the Military Command. Do you remember that?

A. Yes, but I don't remember that number.

H0960-0058

Q. Do you remember that those plts had been organized by Sommer, with him working under your orders?

A. I did not have any orders.

Q. Please answer "yes" or "no".

A. I remember that Sommer was concerned in this action.

Q. You do not remember that Sommer told the Military investigators that he acted according to your orders. Please answer first by "yes" or "no".

A. Yes, he did so, because otherwise he probably would not have been released by the military withorities.

Q. Do you remember that you sent a report to the Military Command, telling him that those plots were due to start of a spontaneous outbreak of the anti-Jewish passion of the French people, whereas you knew already that Sommer had organized these plts. Dodyou remember this report? Please answer "yes" or "no", if you remember this report, afterward you can explain.

A. I don't remember the report in detail.

Q. Do you remember the report itself?

A. I know that the report was made to the Military Command at that time.

Q. Did you report it to the military command?

A. No, I don't remember that,

Q. Is it correct that you had a conversation with Sommer about this project of blowing up these synagogues?

A. No, I don't remember,

Q. It seems advisable to show you the value of your whole testimony. I submit as evidence Document PS 1629, which should be given an Exhibit Number by this Commission. I read to you a letter of October 4 1941, signed by yourself. I quote:

TOP SECRET

Annex 5
to 1 c 464/41 top
secret
of 6.10.41.

COPY

The Deputy of the Chief of the Security Police
and of the Security Service for

H0960-0059

14 June-4-AOW-Meehan.

Belgium and France

Paris Bureau

Paris,- October 4th 1941

H0960-0060

14 June - GH - 1

Subject: Bomb outrage against Paris synagogues during the night of 2/3-10-1941.

Reference: Report of 3.10.41.

During the police investigations by the French authorities, I was able to obtain a first picture of public opinion:

1. The opinion most often heard is that the attacks were planned by the Jews themselves in order to create a feeling of compassion for themselves amongst the broad masses of the people. Many Frenchmen even go so far as to consider the French political police as the instigators, and to assume that the Chief of Cabinet of the Paris Prefect of Police Dallier is the authoritative liaison officer between Jewish capitol and the executive offices This latter interpretation is principally represented in newspaper circles.

2. The French Police on the other hand declare that only DELONCLE would be responsible for such organized outrages.

3. One often hears that version which says that this is a purely "Jewish Business", intended to switch the occurrence into the religious domain, and thereby to stir up agitation against the Germans and the "anti-Jewish laws inspired by them."

4. That which is stated in 3 coincides or rather is proved by those, though isolated, voices the origin of which probably lies with the Jews themselves, which declares that at the time in question(between 2 $^{0}5$ o'clock) nobody could be in the streets except the Germans. Even if it could not be said with resolute certainty that the instigators were Germans; one thing was in any case certain, that there was no question of Frenchmen having perpetrated these deeds.

After the rumor had spread in Paris in the early morning hours of 2.10.1941 that the English had dropped bombs, this error was cleared up in the course of the day when it gradually became known that apparently only synagogues were hit. The press reports in the evening helped to clarify the situation further.

Young people particularly hailed the fact warmly that at least something forcible had been undertaken against the Jews, without seriously taking into consideration the possible men behind perpetrators. In the circle of the Anti-Jewish institute the point of view was taken that it was a good thing to give the Jews a public reminder, and, with regard to the perpetrators

HO960-0061

inclined toward the interpretations as given in 1.

A further report will follow in due course."

Witness, did you listen to the reading of this letter?

A Yes.

Q Do you remember now?.

A Yes, I remember the events.

Q You remember now that you were in touch with Sommer and acted according to higher orders?

A I don't remember how it was. Sommer returned to France later.

Q I did not ask you if Sommer was in France afterwards. I asked if you not Sommer, talked over the matter and acted under superior orders?

A I did not give any instructions. This affair must have been managed by Berlin, I don't know upon whose suggestion.

Q I will read you an extract of the report of the German Military Command. It is a letter sent to the Chief of Police in Berlin:

"The plots were executed by Frenchmen belonging to the Deloncle groups. The explosives were procured by SS-2nd Lieutenant Sommer from Berlin and delivered to the offenders. SS-2nd Lieutenant Sommer was informed of the time of the attacks and was in company of the offenders directly before the attacks.

SS-2nd Lieutenant Sommer acted on the order of the Chief of the Paris branch of the Security Police and of the Security Service, SS-,ieutenant Colonel Dr. Knochen, who — according to the enclosed copy of his report to the Military commander of 4 October 1941 wrongly described these attacks as a 'purely French affair'".

Have you anything to say to this?

A If Sommer had done this at my order, he would not have received the explosives for example from Berlin. It would have been impossible to carry out such an order for such an action simply on my order.

Q Is it correct that you left Paris immediately after those plots, in order to go to Berlin, do you remember?

A I don't remember.

Q I want to read to you the letter sent from Heydrich to the Military Command of France:

H0960-0062

"To the explanations about the explosion plots carried out against 7 Paris synagogues in the night of 2 to 3 October by Frenchmen with the knowledge of the Director of the Paris Agency of my task force detachment, I am taking the following stand:

"The plots of sabotage which were carried out on war-industrial facilities, the acts of sabotage against railroad transports, the assassination attempts on members of the German armed forces and the attempted assassination of French politicians, who openly took a stand for a German French collaboration showed Jewish Communist circles to be the instigator of all these crimes. The German authorities in Paris, as well as the press at that time, pointed out again and again that Jews and Communists are the instigators of the detonation plots and assassination attempts. The political situation made it appear appropriate that aside from the punishments which was handed out it must be shown to the French public and the world public that within the French people there are also forces which are not only prepared to fight Bolshevism but also publicly to attack Jewry which was formerly so powerful in Paris.

On the part of my agency, liaison had also been established with French anti-Semitic groups in the work against international Jewry. The anti-Semitic group of Deloncle was in this respect even formerly known as the most active, whereby DELONCLE - with all reservations because of his otherwise political unpredictability - gave the best guarantee for an uncompromising fight against Jewry. DELONCLE declared for himself that he was ready to carry out reprisal measures against Jewry as the instigators of the attempted plots. His suggestions were accepted by me only at the moment when Jewry was being car marked with all severity even by highest authorities as the responsible arsonist in Europe, who must once and for all disappear in Europe.

The explosion plots against 7 Paris synagogues which were carried out in one night were also a sign for France that Jewry can no longer feel secure in its former European center. All French circles understood this. No doubt could ever arise that these measures are directed exclusively against Jewry; but not against the German Wehrmacht which will never guard or protect Jewish Synagogues. That German offices had knowledge of the plot

H0960-0063

has until now nowhere become known to the French population.

"Due to the peculiarity of the measures to be carried out, the Director of my Paris office did not notify the Commander in Chief, since, on the basis of previous experiences in working together with the Commander in Chief, one could hardly count on the necessary understanding for the necessity of executing these measures in the controversies with world philosophical opponents. Due to the special circumstances of the task he therefore also reported later on what public opinion actually was. I was fully aware of the political importance of the measures adopted especially since for years I have been commissioned to prepare the final solution of the Jewish problem in Europe, I also accept the responsibility for it. According to the reports at hand before me, the injuries of the members of the German Wehrmacht, as a result of the explosion plot, were fortunately not considerable.

For further utilization of my former deputy for Belgium and France, I inform you that SS Brigadefuehrer Dr. Thomas already received from me on 29 September 1941 a new assignment within the scope of the Security Police detailed in the East, which anyhow would not have permitted further utilization in France. For inner-departmental reasons, I summoned SS Obersturmfuehrer Sommer to Berlin. The director of the Paris office, SS Obersturmbannfuehrer Dr. Knochen acted according to the orders given to him. So far there has been no objection to his work in France, so that I shall continue to keep him in the post as director of the special task detachment in France with the Paris office."

Q You acted according to the orders of Heydrich and those plots were within the scope of the tasks of your commands in Paris. Is this correct?

A No.

Q So you claim that the letter of the Chief of the Sipo and SD is not according to the truth and does not give the exact definition of your tasks in France, do you?

A No, but the report is not related exactly as the affair was. The affair was ordered by Berlin without my being concerned in it and as the letter discloses that Sommer was being recalled to Berlin and I was to remain in the office, this fact shows that I did not have a hand in it as you assume.

H0960-0064

Q Do you deny having made this report?

A I certainly did not make this report myself.

Q Did you sign it?

A I must have signed it for it is signed Dr. Knochen.

Q Did you meet Sommer before the plot and did you talk with him about this question. Please answer first "yes" or "no." It is perfectly possible to say "yes" or "no" in answer to the question if someone has met someone or not. Answer these two questions. Did you meet Sommer before the execution of this plot and secondly, did you talk over with him the matter of the plots against the synagogues?

A I met Sommer, but I did not discuss this plot with him.

CAPTAIN TUBRIDY: We will adjourn until Monday at 1000 hours.

(THE COMMISSION ADJOURNED AT 1700 HOURS)

****

The foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the testimony of HELMUT KNOCHEN, taken on 14 June 1946

Charles J. Gallagher
Reporter

Alice Meehan
Reporter

CERTIFIED TO:

Joseph F. Tubridy
Commissioner